

Serial No. 09/893,903

REMARKS**INTRODUCTION**

Claims 1-11 were previously and are currently pending and under consideration.

Claim 12 is added herein.

Therefore, claims 1-12 are now pending and under consideration.

Claims 1-11 are rejected.

Claims 1-11 are amended herein.

No new matter is being presented, and approval and entry are respectfully requested.

REJECTIONS UNDER 35 USC § 112, SECOND PARAGRAPH

In the Office Action, at page 2, claims 8 and 10-11 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, for the reasons set forth therein. Although Applicant traverses the rejection (the rejection appears to be for breadth rather than uncertainty), the claims have been amended for clarity and translational artifacts, which should incidentally resolve the Examiner's concern. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

REJECTIONS UNDER 35 USC § 103

In the Office Action, at pages 3-4, claims 1-11 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Finkelstein. This rejection is traversed and reconsideration is requested.

According to the presently claimed invention, a user can obtain his or her diagnosis result from a first network site of a first entity that has a trusted relationship with the user without at the same time disclosing the user's private information to a second network site of a second entity that does not have a trusted relationship with the user. When the user wishes to receive services from the second network site/entity, the user sends the second network site/entity an ID key issued by the first network site/entity. With this arrangement, the second network site/entity can obtain necessary information from the first network site/entity to start services for the user. This allows the user to receive services provided by the second network site/entity despite the

Serial No. 09/893,903

lack of a trusted relationship with the second network site/entity. And, the second network site/entity can promote sales of products or services to users in an efficient manner.

Finkelstein discusses remotely monitoring asthma severity in real-time. Finkelstein describes, roughly, a configuration similar to the first network site of the presently claimed invention. That is, Finkelstein appears to mention a diagnosis unit, a memory unit, a first transmission unit, and a second transmission unit. However, as discussed below, Finkelstein clearly fails to disclose a second network site/entity as recited in the present claims.

According to Finkelstein, a monitoring station, a central processing facility, and a diagnosis/evaluation station are connected via a network. Test data, test results, response messages, and patient information are reciprocally exchanged in real-time between a patient, a central processing facility, and a physician (column 3, lines 17-20).

However, Finkelstein does not discuss or suggest a second network site/entity that transmits to the first network site/entity an ID key received from a user, thereby obtaining private information of a user from the first network site. In other words, Finkelstein does not disclose a second network site/entity, which, due to the lack of a trusted relationship, is unable to obtain the private information of the user unless the ID key received from the user is sent to the first network site/entity.

Finkelstein cannot produce this advantage. According to Finkelstein, because asthma of a patient is being monitored remotely by a physician, it can be assumed that smooth exchange of information is required between a patient and a physician and therefore there is, as one would expect, a trusted relationship between the patient and the physician. Therefore, the physician does not *need* to send an ID key to another second network site/entity in order to receive private information of the patient from the other second network site/entity; the physician presumably communicates all information directly with the patient.

Based on the foregoing, withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

DEPENDENT CLAIMS

The dependent claims are deemed patentable due at least to their dependence from allowable independent claims. These claims are also patentable due to their recitation of independently distinguishing features. For example, claim 2 recites "the ID key includes disclosable information concerning items of the private information that can be disclosed to the

Serial No. 09/893,903

second site, and the second transmission unit transmit only items of the private information corresponding to the disclosable information". This feature is not taught or suggested by the prior art. Withdrawal of the rejection of the dependent claims is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.


Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: 22 FEB 2005


By: 
James T. Strom
Registration No. 48,702

1201 New York Avenue, NW, Suite 700
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501

CERTIFICATE OF FACSIMILE TRANSMISSION

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being transmitted via facsimile to: Commissioner for Patents,
P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450
on 22 FEB, 2005

STAAS & HALSEY

By: 
Date: 22 FEB 2005